United Nations A/C.5/55/SR.42

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
1 February 2001

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 42nd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 21 December 2000, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Rosenthal ..... (Guatemala)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Mselle

Contents

Agenda item 124: United Nations common system (*continued*)

Agenda item 116: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 2002-2003 *(continued)*

Agenda item 117: Programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001(*continued*)

Agenda item 123: Human resources management(*continued*)

Agenda item 117: Programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001(*continued*)

Capital master plan (*continued*)

Revised estimates of resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its substantive session of 2000 (*continued*)

Programme budget implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/55/L.16/Rev.1, the critical situation of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (*continued*)

First performance report on the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001 (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

01-20019 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

Agenda item 124: United Nations common system (*continued*) (A/C.5/55/L.17)

1. **Mr. Ahounou** (Côte d'Ivoire) introduced draft resolution A/C.5/55/L.17 and stressed that the text before the Committee had been arrived at by consensus.

2. *Draft resolution A/C.5/55/L.17 was adopted.*

Agenda item 116: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 2002-2003 (*continued*) (A/C.5/55/L.25)

3. **Mr. Crom** (Netherlands), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/55/L.25, said that consensus had been reached quickly on the text and he hoped that it would be adopted without a vote.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.5/55/L.25 was adopted.*

Agenda item 117: Programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001 (*continued*)

Agenda item 123: Human resources management (*continued*) (A/C.5/55/L.30)

Draft resolution A/C.5/55/L.3: Safety and security of United Nations personnel

5. *Draft resolution A/C.5/55/L.30 was adopted.*

Agenda item 117: Programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001 (*continued*)

Capital master plan (*continued*) (A/C.5/55/L.28)

6. *Draft resolution A/C.5/55/L.28 was adopted.*

Revised estimates of resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its substantive session of 2000 (*continued*) (A/C.5/55/L.31)

7. **Mr. Adam** (Israel), speaking in explanation of position, noted the extremely inflammatory language used with regard to Israel in resolution S-5/1 adopted by the Commission on Human Rights at its fifth special session and endorsed by the Economic and Social Council. His delegation categorically rejected that resolution as well as the establishment of a human rights inquiry commission and recalled that 19 members of the Economic and Social Council had voted against the resolution in question. He also recalled the statement made by the Secretary-General following his meetings with both sides in the Middle East conflict in which he had urged a cautious approach to the situation. He regretted that funding for a permanent forum on indigenous issues, which his delegation fully supported, had been included in the same draft decision, but his delegation nevertheless felt obliged to dissociate itself from the draft decision.

8. **Mr. Repasch** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, also dissociated his delegation from the draft decision. The decision to fund a human rights inquiry commission was questionable and perhaps wasteful; it would duplicate the work of the fact-finding committee established following the Sharm el-Sheikh summit, which had been agreed to by both Israel and the Palestinian Authority in consultation with the Secretary-General and would detract from the current negotiations in Washington. His delegation supported negotiation and dialogue, not actions which could hinder efforts to achieve peace. The funds allocated to the inquiry commission would be better used for United Nations peace efforts. It would be regrettable if the Committee were to adopt the draft decision.

9. **The Chairman** said the Committee took note of the objections raised by the representatives of Israel and the United States of America.

10. *Draft resolution A/C.5/55/L.31 was so decided.*

11. **Mr. Nakkari** (Syrian Arab Republic) noted that the draft decision authorized commitments arising out of resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council. It stressed the importance of the human rights inquiry commission in response to the recent violence in the occupied territories in the Middle East and the human rights violations by the occupying Power, which could not be ignored by the international community.

12. **Mr. Lenefors** (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the European Union, recalled that the European Union had voted against Economic and Social Council resolution 2000/311. However, it maintained its longstanding position that the Fifth Committee should

not be a forum for political discussions and had therefore joined in the consensus.

13. **Mr. Sanchez Lorenzo** (Cuba) stressed that the Committee was simply approving estimates arising out of resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council. Her delegation had joined in the consensus and it welcomed the opportunity to express support for the cause of the Palestinian people by so doing.

Programme budget implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/55/L.16/Rev.1: The critical situation of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (continued) (A/C.5/55/L.27)

14. *Draft decision A/C.5/55/L.27 was adopted.*

First performance report on the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001 (A/C.5/55/L.24*)

15. **Mr. Crom** (Netherlands), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/55/L.24*, said that since the draft resolution was a consensus text he hoped it would be adopted without a vote.

16. **Mr. Orr** (Canada) pointed out that, in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, the words "higher than" had been omitted by error and should be reinserted before the words "budgeted rate".

17. **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat would ensure that the text was edited appropriately.

18. *Draft resolution A/C.5/55/L.24 was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.